

REMARKS

Receipt of the Office Action of September 22, 2006 is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 6 - 10 were examined and rejected as anticipated by Frick et al under 35 USC 102(b). The Frick et al patent has been carefully studied and in view of this study the noted rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention relates to a pressure measuring unit for measuring absolute, relative or differential pressure of a medium, i.e., a process medium which can be a corrosive process medium. The process medium is the medium which is being monitored it is not a medium separate from the process medium which is part of the measuring unit. To insure that the process medium is not contaminated with metal ions, for example, all surfaces of the measuring unit that comes in contact with the process medium are coated with either enamel or a glassy material. To insure that it is clear that it is the process medium that is not contaminated, claims 6 - 9 have been amended to change "medium: to "process medium."

Frick et al discloses a differential pressure transmitter but, it is respectfully submitted, without the requisite coating on those elements which contact the process medium. Refer to Fig. 4 of Frick et al which shows a differential pressure sensor 56 held in a metal housing 52. The housing 52 comprises two isolator diaphragms 90, which seal off hydraulic paths extending to the differential pressure sensor 56. The surfaces of these diaphragms and the surfaces in the immediate vicinity thereto are exposed to the process medium, i.e., the medium whose pressure is being measured. These surfaces **are not coated**, and it is these surfaces which must be coated if anticipation is to be sustained. And not only coated, but coated with enamel or glass.

Referring to Fig. 5 of Frick et al, there are no surfaces in contact with the process medium, and the rigid insulator 120 cannot be a coating of enamel or glass at the same time. The hydraulic fluid in the sensor should not be confused with the process medium. The two are different. It is for this reason that the claims have been amended

to make it clear that it is the process medium that is the focus not the hydraulic working fluid within the sensor.

In view of the amendments above and the distinction noted, reconsideration and re-consideration are respectfully requested and claims 6 - 10 found allowable.

Date: December 22, 2006

Respectfully submitted,
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



Felix D. Ambrosio
Attorney for Applicant

Registration Number 25,721

Customer Number *23364*
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

S:\Producer\jfd\CLIENTS\Endress+Hauser Holding GmbH\BANH3004 - FL0547\Dec 22 2006 response.wpd